

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,047	01/08/2001	Takuji Gođa	K-1951	6751
7	590 01/15/2003			
KANESAKA AND TAKEUCHI			EXAMINER	
1423 Powhatar Alexandria, V	= '		PIZIALI, ANDREW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	9
			DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Hz
not the second second	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/755,047	GODA ET AL.
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew T Piziali	1775
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspond nc address
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli- (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ace event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exte 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of the ed statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:	
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s): The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection	ons
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request f application in condition for allowance because: §		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims v	· · · ·	• • • •
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 8 and 10.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on i	is a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Examiner.
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. Other:	SUPE	DEBORAH JONES PRISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regardless of the layer functions (barrier, electrode, insulator, etc..) taught by Tsai et al, the article disclosed by Tsai et al in vi w of Ueoka et al and the article disclosed by Tsai et al in view of Ota are not patentably distinct from the article claimed by the applicants.

1/12/03